

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-26 are all the claims pending in the application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 1, 2 and 5-26 are allowed.

Title

The Examiner objects to the title as not descriptive. Applicant submits that the present title is descriptive and notes that the Examiner does not indicate why the title is not descriptive or how the title could be made more descriptive. If the Examiner still believes that the title is not descriptive, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner suggest a title which she believes is more descriptive.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 2 and 5-26 stand objected to because the claims allegedly describe the holding portion as different from a coil or wire filament and the specification allegedly describes the holding filament as a coil filament.

Applicant submits that the claims and the specification are clear and consistent. For example, claim 1 recites that “the first heater has a coil filament and a wire filament provided alternately in the central region and has a holding portion filament provided on the outside of the image region.” The specification is consistent with this claim recitation. For example, the non-limiting embodiment of Fig. 3A shows a first heater with alternately provided coil filaments 103 and wire filaments 104. The non-limiting embodiment also includes holding portion filaments 105. Applicant submits that there is nothing unclear about the separate recitation of coil

filaments, wire filaments and holding portion filaments, and that such a recitation is consistent with the specification.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki (JP 59-038773). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 4 recites that “a heat distribution obtained by the overlap of the first heater and the second heater includes peaks at opposite side ends of a maximum image region.” For example, the non-limiting embodiment of Fig. 5 shows peaks at opposite sides of the maximum image region Wlp. With reference to Suzuki Fig. 2, the first heater 4 and the second heaters 3 overlap away from the ends. Also, the first and second heaters 4, 3 only overlap at a single region. Accordingly, as shown in Fig. 3, there is only a single peak of the heat distribution and it occurs away from the ends. Accordingly, Suzuki clearly does not teach or suggest heat distribution peaks as claimed.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claim 4 is allowable over Suzuki and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 4.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/776, 636

DOCKET NO. Q79876

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



David P. Emery
Registration No. 55,154

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 5, 2006